

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1 and 11. These sheets replace the original drawing sheets encompassing FIGS. 1 through 13. FIGS. 1 through 13 have been revised to include the missing reference identifying the appropriate features.

Attachment: Twelve (12) Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Conrow et al. (US 6,763,199).

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakata et al. (US 6,687,471).

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sakai et al. (US 5,887,223). Claims 1, 4, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (US 5,576,811).

Claims 3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrow et al. (US 5,742,867) in view of Kodama (US, 5,742,867) and Hirai et al. (US 6,148,168).

Claim 16 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicants amend independent claims 1, 8, and 15 by incorporating the features of dependent claim 3, amend independent claim 12 by incorporating the features of dependent claim 14, amend dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9, 13, and 16 to further define the invention, cancel dependent claims 3 and 14 without prejudice or disclaimer from further consideration, and amend the Specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-13, and 15-16 are presently pending for consideration. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings citing 13 figures.

Objection to the SPECIFICATION

The Specification stands objected to because of minor informalities. Applicants amend the Specification in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because references to the features indicated in the Specification are missing from the drawings. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits concurrently herewith a Submission of Replacement Drawings to include the missing references to the features discussed in the Specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Conrow et al. (US 6,763,199); and claims 3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Conrow et al. (US 5,742,867) in view of Kodama (US, 5,742,867) and Hirai et al. (US 6,148,168). Applicants traverse the rejections of all claims for at least the following reasons.

Applicants cancel claims 3 and 14 without prejudice or disclaimer from further consideration. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 3 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, all recite an image forming apparatus, in part, "an adjusting part that determines an image misregistration value" and "if the obtained misregistration value is smaller than a predetermined specification value, the adjusting part

bypasses process to obtain an adjusting value for a use condition of the corresponding image forming member, and if the obtained misregistration value is equal to or larger than a predetermined specification value, the adjusting part proceeds process to obtain the adjusting value to adjust the use condition of the corresponding image forming member.” Similarly, independent claim 12, as amended, recites an image forming method ,in part, “the adjusting step determines an image misregistration value” and “if the obtained misregistration value is smaller than a predetermined specification value, process to obtain an adjusting value for the use condition of the corresponding image forming member is bypassed, and if the obtained misregistration value is equal to or larger than a predetermined specification value, process to obtain the adjusting value to adjust the use condition of the corresponding image forming member proceeds.”

The Office Action alleges that Conrow et al. teaches an adjusting part that adjusts a use condition of an image forming member used in the image forming part on the basis of image data read by the read part (col. 15, line 45 to col. 16, line 27). Applicants respectfully disagree. In contrast to the Applicants’ claimed invention, Conrow et al. teaches a single step to determine and correct six independent registration errors prior to start of the printing job, which involves a series of geometrical transformations (i.e., a set of algorithms) based on the registration geometry pattern 150 (Abstract, col. 7, line 11 to col. 14, line 10). Applicants respectfully submit that while Conrow et al. is adapted to process a full cycle of computation, Conrow et al. is completely silent about the bypass scheme to avoid unnecessary computation in order to obtain each of the six independent registration errors. On the other hand, Applicants’ claimed invention is adapted to bypass the certain set of computation processes when the adjusting part determines that the misregistration value obtained from the test image is within the tolerance. Thus, Applicants

respectfully submit that Conrow et al. fails to teach or suggest at least the features recited in the amended independent claims 1, 12, and 15, hence respective dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, and 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 12, 13, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sakata et al. (US 6,687,471); claims 1, 4, 6, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sakai et al. (US 5,887,223); and claims 1, 4, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (US 5,576,811). Applicants traverse the rejection of all claims for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action alleges that Sakai et al. teaches an adjusting part that adjusts a use condition of an image forming member used in the image forming part on the basis of image data read by the read part 10 (co. 8, lines 35-40 and 48-52, col. 11. lined 2-10). In addition, the Office Action alleges that Sakata et al. teaches an adjusting part that adjusts a use condition of an image forming member used in the image forming part on the basis of image data read by the read part 138 (col. 21, lines 20-44). Furthermore, the Office Action alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches an adjusting part that adjusts a use condition of an image forming member used in the image forming part on the basis of image data read by the read part 608 (col. 8, lines 16-23 and FIGs. 1 and 8). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sakai et al. teaches an image forming apparatus implemented with a method to measure an optimal amount of toner based on the unfixed toner image so that constant image quality is maintained (Abstract). Similarly, Kobayashi et al. teaches an image forming apparatus implemented with the image density measuring device to

measure the density of standard pattern printed on the recording medium so that the quality of output image can be controlled (Abstract). Furthermore, Sakata et al. teaches an image forming apparatus implemented with a density sensor 138 to detect the position, shape and density of the patch image printed in the margin portion of the recording sheet, in which the type of printing job (i.e., double-sided, copy, etc.) and the toner density of output image are controlled by the image data obtained from the patch image (col. 20, line 9 to col. 21, line 46). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakata et al., Sakai et al., and Kobayashi et al., whether taken singly or combined, are completely silent about adapting the bypass scheme in the algorithms to obtain the parameter(s) for the specific printing member(s) dedicated to control the toner density, and silent about measuring additional parameter(s) for additional printing member(s).

Accordingly, in light of the argument presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakai et al., Kobayashi et al., and Sakata et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to anticipate at least the features of amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, and 15, hence dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, and 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 102(e) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments and reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: April 21, 2005

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001